APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/690,313	10/17/2000	James L. Keesey	STL920000052US2/A8504	3435

46159   7590   06/14/2010
SUGHRUE MION PLLC
USPTO CUSTOMER NO WITH IBM/SVL
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER
HAN, QI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/14/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/690,313
Filing Date: October 17, 2000
Appellant(s): KEESEY ET AL.

_____
Mark E. Wallerson
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 05/17/2010 appealing from the Office action mailed

08/11/2009.

(1) Real Party in Interest.

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The following is a list of claims that are rejected and pending in the application:

Claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-29 and 31-40.

(4) Status of Amendments

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The examiner has no comment on the summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to

be reviewed on appeal. Every ground of rejection set forth in the Office action from which the

appeal is taken (as modified by any advisory actions) is being maintained by the examiner except

for the grounds of rejection (if any) listed under the subheading "WITHDRAWN

REJECTIONS." New grounds of rejection (if any) are provided under the subheading "NEW

GROUNDS OF REJECTION."

(7) Claims Appendix

The examiner has no comment on the copy of the appealed claims contained in the

Appendix to the appellant's brief.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

9,185,535	HEDIN et al.	2-2001
6,532,446	KING	3-2003
6,085,160	D'HOORE et al.	7-2000

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-29, 31-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over HEDIN et al. (US 6,185,535 B1) hereinafter referenced as HEDIN in view of KING (US

6,532,446 B1) and D'HOORE et al. (US 6,085,160) hereinafter referenced as D'HOORE.

Regarding **claim 14**, HEDIN discloses 'voice control of a user interface to service

applications' (title), comprising:

"a device for receiving and transmitting data" (Fig. 1a and col. 4, lines 25, 'the client part

101 (corresponding to device) receives speech (data) from user', 'those words (data) …sent

(transmit) to the server part 103');

"a computer having a data store coupled thereto, wherein the data store stores data,

connected to the device" (Fig. 1 and col. 4, lines 46-50, 'the server (a computer) part 103 is

implemented in a separated processor (computer)' that 'is more powerful (e.g., faster, more

storage space (data store), etc.)', 'the first digital link 105 for coupling (connecting) the client

and server part 101, l03 may be wireless or wireline'); and

 "one or more computer programs, performed by the computer" (col. 6, lines 31-35,

'various embodiments may utilize one or more programmable elements (computer programs)

executing a stored program to perform a number of functions') for:

"receiving voice data and a device identifier from the device" (col. 5, lines 20-22,

'the server…uses its own, more powerful ASR to analyze the received speech (voice

data)'; col. 4, lines 62-63 and col. 1, lines 21-34, 'WAP (Wireless Application Protocol)

URL (interpreted as device identifier) services', wherein WAP inherently includes device

identifier(s) (such as Client ID) for both sides of communication);

"translating the voice data to text", (col. 5, lines 20-22, 'the server…uses its own, more powerful ASR (speech-to-text) to analyze the received speech (voice data); col. 6, lines 6-7, 'the spoken text will either be recognized and converted (translated) to text by the ASR in the client 101, or alternatively by the ASR in the gateway/proxy part 107 (replacing server part 103)');

"determining whether to filter the translated text" and "if it is determined that the translated text is to be filtered, applying a filter to the translated text", (col. 5, lines 43-55 'when the data formats are different' determining 'to convert (filter) the data from one format to the other' (wherein converting formats is interpreted as filtering, in light of specification: see page 6, lines 16-20), 'conversion …not only substituting (formatting) keywords from one format to another (e.g. from HTML (text) to WML), but also some level of filtering to weed out data that cannot be received by the terminal…').

HEDIN does not **expressly** disclose "the translated text is returned to the device." However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by KING who discloses 'server based speech recognition user interface for wireless devices' (title), and teaches that 'the symbolic data file (corresponding to translated text) is then sent back to the originating mobile device' (col. 3, lines 16-19) and 'the processed symbolic data file…may be reformatted (filtered) …then sent to the requesting mobile device or to a designated third party device' (col. 10, lines 32-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify HEDIN by providing sending the recognized/converted/reformatted symbolic data (text) back to the originating device (or a designated third party device), as taught by KING, for the purpose (motivation) of improving the usability and commercial viability of

network for using speech recognition services (KING: col. 2, lines 37-43).   In addition, in

another view of HEDIN's disclosure, it can be seen that HEDIN teaches that 'data pass on to

client 101', 'audio' is 'supplied to the client part 101' and 'information (including text) can then

be sent back to the TAP203' (col. 5, line 53 to col. 6, line 5 and col. 9, lines 64-66). These

teachings **imply** (or suggest) sending data with a requiring device identifier, because without the

device identifier the processed data cannot be sent back to the requiring client/device.

     Further, it is noted that HEDIN in view of KING does not expressly disclose "the voice

data is translated to text **using a voice print**" that "is retrieved from datastore based on the

device identifier". However, the feature using voice print for speech recognition is well known

in the art as evidenced by D'HOORE who discloses 'language independent speech recognition'

(title), and teaches that 'the words in the vocabulary of recognizable word may be described by a

voice print…' (col. 2, lines 1-5), 'when signal language models are used, the speech recognition

system…mapping (translating) the speech (voice data) onto language specific symbols (read on

text)', 'the system will automatically construct the best possible phoneme or model unit sequence

to describe the word (text word), based on the phoneme model database (datastore) and the

uttered speech', 'this sequence is referred to as a voice print' and 'these **voice prints** can be **used**

(matched/retrieved from the database or datastore) to **recognize** (translate) utterances (voice

data) of the trained word (text word to be recognized from the speech/utterances) by the speaker'

(col. 7, lines 32-55). Further, as stated above, since HEDIN discloses that 'in a multi-user

environment, each user's profile must be stored (datastore)' (col. 1, lines 66-67; also col. 8, lines

56-58), sending recognized data back to client device (col. 5, line 53 to col. 6, line 5 and col. 9,

lines 64-66), and D'HOORE discloses speech recognition and speaker identification using voice

prints (col. 7, lines 45-55), one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that voice print

as user-specific speech data could be readily and properly stored in database and using device

identifier (such as WAP URL) stored in user profile for matching/retrieving the related voice

prints, because voice print user profile would be a suitable place to keep/store user-related

identifier(s) (such as user device id) and voice print would be better match the speech of the

targeted speaker/user, and the result would be predicable to the skilled person in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine teachings of HEDIN in view of KING and D'HOORE by providing

speech recognition using stored voice prints in a related database and using stored user/client

device identifier (such as URL) in a user profile for identifying/retrieving user specific speech

data (such voice prints) from the database, for the purpose (motivation) of better matching the

speech of the targeted speaker for speech recognition (D'HOORE: col. 7, lines 34-53).

Regarding **claim 15** (depending on claim 14), HEDIN in view of KING and D'HOORE

further discloses "storing a user profile in a data store connected to the computer", (HEDIN: col.

1, lines 66-67, 'in a multi-user environment, each user's profile must be stored'; col. 8, lines 56-

58, 'the RAP server 205' 'may be implemented as a multi-user, central WAP application

server').

Regarding **claim 16** (depending on claim 15), HEDIN in view of KING and D'HOORE

further discloses "user profile comprises a voice print" (HEDIN: col. 1, lines 66-67, 'each user's

profile must be stored'; D'HOORE: col. 7, lines 45-55, 'voice prints… can also be used to check

or detect the identity of the speaker'; so that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to modify HEDIN in view of KING and D'HOORE

by providing a voice print in a user profile, because voice print is user specific information and user profile is most suitable place to keep user specific information).

Regarding **claim 18** (depending on claim 14), HEDIN in view of KING and D'HOORE further discloses "determining comprises extracting one or more key words from the translated text", (HEDIN: col. 5, lines 45-55 'conversion …not only substituting keywords from one format to another (e.g. from HTML (text) to WML), but also some level of filtering to weed out data that cannot be received by the terminal'; HEDIN: col. 5, lines 24-28, 'the recognized speech (the translated text) may consist of commands (keywords) for controlling the server application, in which case the command are acted upon' (implying the command is extracted); HEDIN: col. 9, lines 59-67, 'if the ASR 307 looks for…the phrase "*CALL*", then the ASR 107 will detect (corresponding to extract) that the unrecognized isolated word consists of the word "CALL" with another unrecognized part following it').

Regarding **claim 19** (depending on claim 18), HEDIN in view of KING and D'HOORE further discloses "a filter is selected based on one or more extracted key words" (HEDIN: col. 5, lines 43-55, 'conversion …not only substituting (formatting) keywords from one format to another (e.g. from HTML (text) to WML), but also some level of filtering to weed out data that cannot be received by the terminal…'; col. 15, lines 59-66, the devices used for the applications can be 'a WAP-enabled phone', 'electronic notepads', or 'windows-based' 'computer'; col. 5, lines 24-26, 'the recognized speech (text) may consist of commands (extracted keywords) for controlling server application'; col. 9, lines 55-67, 'TP (terminal part) command words (extracted keywords, such as "CALL")'; col. 5, lines 59-66, different 'services' and/or 'applications' that request displaying menus; it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that the recognized commands

(keywords) could be associated with different devices or applications that have different textual

display formats, such as menus, so as to combine the different teachings of HEDIN together by

providing different text formats for different devices and/or applications based on the recognized

commands (keywords), for the purpose (motivation) of providing enhanced and extended

services/applications in advanced mobile networks for the user (HEDIN: col.4, lines 63-65)).

Regarding **claim 20** (depending on claim 14), HEDIN in view of KING and D'HOORE

further discloses "applying the filter comprises formatting the translated text", (HEDIN: col. 5,

lines 45-55 'when the data formats are different… convert (filter) the data (translated text) from

one format to the other', 'conversion …not only substituting (formatting) keywords from one

format to another (e.g. from HTML (text) to WML), but also some level of filtering to weed out

data that cannot be received by the terminal…').

Regarding **claim 21**(depending on claim 20), HEDIN in view of KING and D'HOORE

discloses "formatting the translated text for an application", (HEDIN: col. 5, lines 50-55, 'if the

server 109 is an application that is accessible via the Internet…pass on to the client 101 only that

data (text data) that is appropriate'; col. 14,10-21,'weather information service' (application);

col. 15, lines 55-67; interactive voice controlled services (applications)').

Regarding **claim 22** (depending on claim 20), HEDIN in view of KING and D'HOORE

further discloses "formatting the translated text for the device", (HEDIN: col. 15, lines 62-63,

'voice-enabled special devices, such as electronic notepads').

Regarding **claims 23-24 and 26** (depending on claim 14), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 14, because it also reads on the limitations of claims 23-24 and 26 respectively.

Regarding **claim 25** (depending on claim 24), HEDIN in view of KING and D'HOORE further discloses "returning the filtered text via an electronic mail message", (KING: col. 2, lines 63-64, 'email').

Regarding **claims 1-3 and 5-13**, they recite a method. The rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 14-16 and 18-26 respectively, because the method claims and apparatus claims are related as apparatus and method of using same, with each claimed element's function corresponding to the claimed method step.

Regarding **claims 27-29 and 31-39**, they recite an article of manufacture. The rejection is based on the same reason described for claims 14-16 and 18-26 respectively, because the article claims and apparatus claims are related as apparatus and article of using same, with each claimed apparatus element's function corresponding to the claimed article element's function.

Regarding **claim 40** (depending on claim 1), HEDIN in view of KING and D'HOORE further discloses "the device identifier comprises a unit identifier which identifies a particular device operated by a user" (KING: col. 6, line 41-42, 'the contact information …(e.g. a phone number or a uniform resource indicator (URI), which is read on unit identifier) may be embedded in software loaded on the mobile device'; col. 9, lines 53-58, 'each of the mobile devices serviced by link server device is assigned an identification (ID) or device (ID)' (read on unit identifier) and 'a device ID can be a phone number of the device or an IP address or a combination of an IP address and a port number', it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine teachings of HEDIN, KING and

D'HOORE by providing an ID for each device, such as using a phone number, IP address, or

URI for each of mobile devices, taught by KING, for the purpose (motivation) of identifying

mobile device to outside entities and corresponding the device with associated user account

(KING: col. 8, lines 38-43)).

(10) Response to Argument

Response to Arguments

Appellant's arguments (Brief: pages 9-21) filed on 05/17/2010 with respect to the claim

rejection under 35 USC 103, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

1.   In response to Appellant's arguments regarding rejection of claim 14 (also applied to 1

and 27) that "Hedin (similar to King) does not teach or suggest <u>making any kind of</u>

<u>determination whether the translated text of voice data should be filtered and then applying the</u>

<u>filter if the determination is made that it should be filtered</u> (emphasized by appellant" (see Brief:

pages 9-10, and page 20, paragraph 3), examiner respectfully disagrees with the appellant's

arguments and has a different view of prior art teachings and claim interpretations. It is noted

that, Hedin clearly teaches that 'the spoken text …be recognized and converted (i.e. translated)

to text (i.e. translated text) …by the ASR(automatic speech recognition) in the gateway/proxy

part 107' (col. 6, lines 6-8), 'when (if) the data formats are different (so as to determine applying

filter, i.e. format conversion), one function (filter function) of the gateway/proxy part 107 is to

convert (filter) the data from one format to the other' and 'conversion …include not only

substituting **keywords** (text) **from one format to another** (e.g. from HTML (text) to WML),

but also some level of **filtering** to weed out data that cannot be received by the terminal…' (col.

5, lines 43-55), which is properly read on the claim. It can be seen that, at this point, Hedin's

converting data format (or filtering data) is properly read on or interpreted as the claimed "filter

(or filtering)", **in light of specification** (see **page 6, lines 16-20**); here, Hedin's data clearly

includes keyword (i.e. text); and Hedin's condition of "when the data formats are different" is

properly read on the similar condition of claimed "determining whether to filter…" Therefore,

rejection with the prior art teachings satisfies the claimed/argued limitations.   In addition, it is

should be pointed out that the rejection for the above argued limitation is based on the teachings

of **Hedin** (**not King**) as stated above, while reference of King is used for rejection of other

limitation in a combination manner (see below), so that the applicant's arguments regarding the

above limitation (i.e. claimed "determining…" step) by using King's reference, are not proper

and not persuasive.

2.   In response to Appellant's arguments regarding rejection of claim 14 (also applied to 1

and 27) that "Examiner has failed to articulate a credible motivation to modify Hedin, King and

D'hoore to achieve the claimed invention" (Brief: page 13, paragraph 2), "the fact that Hedin

discloses no need or benefit for receiving text at the terminal device" (Brief: page 13, last

paragraph), "Hedin appears to teach away from King, since Hedin teaches that audio data may be

sent to the client and played for the user so that the user may hear the possible selections rather

than having to view them on the screen" (Brief: page 14, last paragraph), and "the Examiner has

not provided a convincing line of reasoning of why one skilled in the art would have found the

combination of the teachings of the cited references obvious" (Brief: page 15, paragraph 1)

(wherein the underlined contents are emphasized by the appellant), the examiner respectfully

disagrees with the appellant's arguments and has a different view of the prior art teachings and

obviousness/motivation of combining references.

It should be pointed out that the reason to bring the reference of King is that King

expressly teaches the claimed limitation "the translated text is returned to the device" in the way

that 'the symbolic data file (corresponding to translated text) is then sent back to the originating

mobile device' (col. 3, lines 16-19) and 'the processed symbolic data file…may be reformatted

…then sent to the requesting mobile device or to a designated third party device' (col. 10, lines

32-48). Thus, based on the teachings of both Hedin and King, the examiner further analyzed and

concluded in the rejection that: "Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to modify HEDIN by providing sending the

recognized/converted/reformatted symbolic data (text) back to the originating device (or a

designated third party device), as taught by KING, for the purpose (motivation) of improving the

usability and commercial viability of network for using speech recognition services (KING: col.

2, lines 37-43)". By reviewing the rejection and prior art teachings, the examiner believes that

the rejection clearly provides factual evidences from combined prior art teachings that read on

the claimed/argued limitations, and properly provides the analysis/rationale of

obviousness/motivation for the combination.

Regarding obviousness/motivation for combining the references, it is also can be seen

that both Hedin and King work in the same field of endeavor (i.e. involving speech recognition

in server-device/terminal based network/communication environment), and solve the same/or

similar problems (including transmitting speech/voice, translating/recognizing speech to text,

formatting (filtering) text from one to another), so that, the purpose of improving (or expending)

usability (such as distributing/transmitting translated text not only to other server disclosed by

Hedin but also original requesting device disclosed by King) and commercial viability (such as

third party device (whoever is needed commercially) disclosed by King) of an existing network

for using speech recognition service, would be good reason of obviousness (or motivation) for

the combination, to one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made.

        Further, it is noted that the applicant failed to treat the prior art disclosure of Hedin **as a**

whole, since the applicant's arguments only recite the portion of the Hedin's teachings regarding

sending back **audio** data and concluded that "Hedin appears to teach away from King" (Brief:

page 14, last paragraph). However, in fact, Hedin also teaches that 'the TA 203 and TAP 201

embody the client part 101 (i.e. terminal device)' (col. 6, line 19-22), provides examples that 'the

TAP send the unrecognized 'phrase' or 'TP-commands' to 'RAP's (remote side) ASR307' and

then 'a list of recognizable TP commands', or recognized 'phrase'/'command' (such 'CALL

JOHN'), or portion of recognized TP-command (such word 'CALL') **can be sent back to** the

TAP 203 (terminal device)' (col. 9, lines, 36-67), which clearly shows that Hedin does **not teach**

away from King **at all**, but shows more common problem to be solved for the combination.

        In addition, in another view of Hedin, one of skill in the art would have readily

recognized that the above Hedin's teachings would be properly read on the clamed/argued

limitation "the translated text is returned to the device", based on broadest reasonable

interpretation of the claimed limitations in light of the specification. This means that Hedin's

disclosure alone can satisfy the above argued limitations.

3.   In response to Appellant's arguments regarding rejection of claim 14 (also applied to 1

and 27) that "D'hoore has no relevance to the claimed invention", "there is no teaching or

suggestion in D'hoore that the voice print is used to translate voice data into text", "D'hoore does

not use the voice print to translate voice data to text as claimed", "D'hoore does not teach or

suggest that voice data is translated to text. Instead, D'hoore teaches a speech recognition system

which produces a speech related signal from inputted speech" (Brief: page 16, paragraph 3 to

page 18, paragraph 4), "There is simply no teaching or suggestion in D'hoore that the WAP URL

is associated with a voice print", "There is no teaching or suggestion in Hedin that a device

identifier is transmitted to the computer as recited in the claims, nor would it be inherent that a

device identifier is transmitted to the computer simply because Hedin teaches using a WAP

standard", "Hedin does not teach or suggest, inherently or explicitly, "transmitting the voice data

and a **device identifier** to a computer", as claimed" (Brief: page 19, paragraph 1 to page 20,

paragraph 2), the examiner respectfully disagrees with the appellant's arguments and has a

different view of the prior art teachings and the claim interpretations.

        It is noted that D'hoore teaches speech recognition including language model, acoustic

model phoneme database and speech database (Fig. 4 and claim 1), and using voice print for

speech recognition, which can be used to improve or modify the speech recognition system

disclosed by Hedin in view of King, as rejected, for better matching the speech of the targeted

speaker for speech recognition (D'HOORE: col. 7, lines 34-53). This is clearly relevant to the

rejection providing factual evidence(s) and motivation/obviousness for the combination, against

the claimed invention.

It should be pointed out that the appellant's arguments failed to respond to or silenced about the examiner's point that basic and necessary functionality of speech recognition is to recognize (or translate or convert) speech/utterance **into text word in nature**, i.e. the recognized words as result/output of a speech recognition must be text (written/printed/displayed symbols or words), which is common knowledge in the art. It is also noted that the appellant failed to treat D'hoore's disclosure as a whole. It can be seen that D'hoore clearly teaches his invention being **'a speech recognition system'** including 'acoustic models' dealing with 'subword unit (such as phoneme)' and 'language model' dealing with 'recognizable words (text)', and recognizes the input speech as specific word sequence (i.e text)' (see abstract, Fig. 4, claim 1 and col. 1, lines 41-53). D'hoore also teaches that 'when single **language models** are used, the speech recognition system…to mapping the speech onto language specific symbols (generated from language model so as being words or text)' and the system can use 'voice prints' with 'phoneme model database' to 'recognize utterance of the trained word by the speaker' (col. 7, lines 36-51). However, the appellant's arguments only recite portion of D'hoore's teachings that is related to the phonetic model/database, but totally ignored D'hoore's other teachings regarding result/output of the whole speech recognition system and language model (such as Figs. 1 and 4, 'recognition result 15', 'identified speech' from 48, and output of 14 or 49), which necessarily/inherently includes recognized/translated text word that is also supported by both Hedin and King.

Further, it is common knowledge in the art that a speech recognition system may comprises a acoustic/phonetic model and a word/language model, wherein the acoustic/phonetic model (such as phoneme model disclosed by D'hoore) recognizes/translates "sound" ("prognostication" or "utterance") to generate recognizable sound/phonetic representations, i.e.

symbols representing different sound/speech units, such as phonemes. These phonetic

representations or symbols are usually presented in visual or written form, such as the symbols

shown in first column of Table 1 disclosed by D'hoore, which is clearly in a text form.

Therefore, based on broadest reasonable interpretation of claimed limitation(s) in light of

specification and common knowledge in the art, one of ordinary skill in the art would have

recognized that the claimed "translated text" can be properly read on either recognized/translated

text symbols/words as final result/output of a speech recognition system (or language model) as

stated above, or recognized/translated sound/phonetic representations in visual/written form,

such as symbols of phonemes disclosed in Table 1 of D'hoore.

Furthermore, it is noted that the rejection for the argued limitation "the voice print is

retrieved from a datastore based on the device identifier" is based on the teachings of the

combined references, so that the applicant's arguments (Brief: page 19, paragraph 1 to page 20,

paragraph 2) against the references individually are not proper, since one cannot show

nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on

combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re*

Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this case, it can be seen the

facts that: (1) Hedin teaches using WAP (Wireless Application Protocol) URL (interpreted as

device identifier) services/standard (col. 4, lines 62-63 and col. 1, lines 21-34), wherein WAP

inherently includes device identifier(s) (such as Client ID) for both sides of communication; and

those words (spoken words, i.e. speech) …sent the server part (or remote side) and then sending

other data (including audio or recognized text) back to client device (col. 5, line 18 to col. 6, line

5 and col. 9, lines 64-66), which imply/suggest sending data with the requiring device identifier,

otherwise, the data cannot be sent back to the client device, so that the client/device identifier for

either receiving data or transmitting data was known; (2) Hedin teaches 'in a multi-user

environment, each user's profile must be stored (datastore)' and RAP (on remote side) may be a

multi-user server and has more powerful ASR and reference database (col. 1, lines 66-67 and col.

8, lines 56-65), so that retrieving the speech data (not voice prints) from related database and

using user's profile in speech recognition server were known; (3) D'hoore discloses using voice

print with phoneme model database for speech recognition, as stated above, (col. 7, lines 35-55),

so that retrieving voice print from a datastore (or related/referenced database) for speech

recognition was also know; (4) D'hoore teaches that 'voice print will better match the speech of

the targeted speaker than the speech of another speaker' (col. 7, lines 35-55), which further

provides good reason (obviousness/motivation) for combining the teachings. Based on these

teachings, one of skill in the art would have recognized that the identification function of using

the received device/client identifier (such as URL) for sending data back (as taught/suggested by

Hedin) would be in the same or similar way of using (based on) it for identifying a user/client

specific speech data (such as voice prints) for matching/retrieving them from database with input

speech, and the identifier would be suitably stored in a user profile, and the result would be

predicable. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to combine teachings of HEDIN in view of KING and D'HOORE by

providing speech recognition using stored voice prints in related database and using stored

user/client device identifier (such as URL) in a user profile for identifying/retrieving a user

specific speech data (such voice prints) from the database, for the purpose (motivation) of better

matching the speech of the targeted speaker/user for speech recognition (D'HOORE: col. 7, lines

34-53).

For the above reasons, it is believed that the arguments are not persuasive.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related

Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

QI HAN
(06/04/2010)

Conferees:
(05/27/2010)

Dorvil, Richemond
/Richemond Dorvil/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626

Wozniak, James
/James S. Wozniak/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626

Han, Qi

/QI HAN/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2626